

RATING LITERARY AND ARTISTIC INSTITUTIONS.

We mentioned last week the decision of the assistant judge in respect of the Russell Institution and parochial rates. To set at rest the doubts which have been raised as to the extent of the exemption given by the Act 6th and 7th of Vict., c. 36, a Bill has been brought in by the Attorney-General to amend the same.

The Bill provides:—That from and after the passing of this Act, the said Act of the seventh year of the reign of her present Majesty shall be deemed and taken to exempt all persons from liability to be rated or assessed to any county, borough, parochial, or other local rates or cesses, in respect of any land, houses, or buildings, or parts of houses or buildings, belonging to any society or institution, founded or existing exclusively for purposes of religion, education, charity, science, literature, the useful arts, or the fine arts, or for more than one of such purposes jointly, provided that such society or institution shall be supported wholly or in part by annual contributions, and shall not make, and shall not by any of its laws, rules, or regulations, contemplate, or provide for the making, any dividend, gift, division, or bonus in money unto or between any of its members, and provided also that such society shall obtain the certificate of the barrister-at-law or Lord Advocate, as in the said recited Act mentioned.

When it is remembered that there are nearly 300 mechanics' institutions in active operation, besides 400 in abeyance on account of the state of trade, this is seen to be an important matter.

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH, ARMITAGE-BRIDGE, YORKSHIRE.

THE new church at Armitage-bridge, built in the decorated or second pointed style, by Mr. Chantrell, contains a nave 63 feet by 18 broad, north and south aisles of 9 feet each, and a chancel 28 feet by 16; a robing room 9½ feet by 8, with a species of tribune above it, opening into the chancel and south aisle by treble arches. The nave is divided from the aisles on each side by four pillars and two halves, supporting five arches. There is no clerestory. All the windows have two lights, excepting the east window of the chancel, which has five, and the western one in the tower, which has three lights. The tower walls increase the external square to 19 feet, and the buttresses, in three stages, are subdivided so as to produce five offsets. Between the four main pinnacles are four subordinate ones, rising from carved figured brackets, below a carved cornice, and open wave and trefoil parapets. The roofs are all open and boarded; the nave and chancel being cradled, and those of the side aisles arch-trussed and all boarded; the boards painted blue, the timbers stained as oak. The walls are covered internally with "Martin's cement." The east end of the chancel is decorated with tracery, and has a painted window, by Mr. Willement.

The seats are all open, with oak elbows, and there are ten oak stalls in the chancel, with carved ends and finials, misereres, &c. The reading desk is an open frame work, and the pulpit is an elaborate oak hexagonal construction, supported by six columns, arches, and canopies. The western screen in the tower, and the stairs and fronts to the organ gallery are very elaborately carved. The churchyard has a low wall, covered with a plain double-shelled coping, and the stone lich gate is opposite the principal entrance, and a small wicket door leads to the priest's entrance to the chancel and to the sacristy, from the nearest point to the parsonage house. The total cost we are told was 5,000*l*.

BATTERSEA PARK.—Mr. Budge, an owner of property required for the proposed park, and for which he had received notice long ago, finding that the Commissioners of Woods and Forests did not intend to proceed, applied on Tuesday, at the Hall Court, through counsel, for a rule to show cause why a *mandamus* should not issue commanding the Commissioners to issue their precept for summoning a jury to assess compensation. The application was granted.

TREATMENT OF ARCHITECTS.

Sir,—Knowing that your pages are open to all communications that may benefit the profession, I beg the insertion of the following instance of an architect's endeavours to accommodate his employer being abused and taken advantage of. In one of the principal streets of one of the principal cities of the west of England, a few months since, a house was burnt down; the owner called on an architect, and asked him what his charges were for planning and superintending buildings. Being answered 5 per cent. on the outlay, he pleaded poverty, and asked him to take less, naming the locality, and as an inducement holding out that he had much other property in the city which might need the services of a professional person. The architect said that 5 per cent. on small amounts hardly remunerated a man for his labour; however, as the other seemed anxious to employ him, he at length agreed to his terms, which were about one-third below the percentage. The employer immediately drew out an agreement, purporting that the building was to be planned and superintended for the sum named, and it was signed by both parties. The architect then received full instructions on the site, and answers were readily given to all the needful questions by the employer. Acting precisely upon those instructions, plans and an elevation were prepared in pencil. When the owner saw them he was not satisfied, and in opposition to his directions, ordered the architect to alter the heights of floors, &c., to correspond with an adjoining house, not ranging architecturally with it. The drawings were altered to measurements of this house. The next day a new crochets had entered the employer's head. These heights would not do, and he ordered him to measure another house (but not with any intention of its ranging) adjoining the premises on the other side, and alter the plans to that. Yielding again to his caprice, the architect complied, cautioning him, before deciding on the staircase, to ascertain if there was any foundation for a hint given by the adjoining proprietor that his light would be infringed on by the proposed staircase. He was ordered to go on, which he did, yielding to farther whims.

Two or three days afterwards quoin for a window were observed carrying up in a party wall by the owner of the adjoining property, looking into the staircase area. Matters having now broken out into open hostility, the intending trespasser found that he must place his staircase somewhere else, and plan the whole house over again.

He had not the grace to regret, even in polite acknowledgments, the contrary directions he had troubled the architect with, but charged him vehemently with not having observed his instructions, and wrote him a letter to that effect. The other replied that he had extended his courtesy to the utmost, and that if there must be fresh plans there must be a fresh agreement. The employer brought an attorney to try and persuade him there must not be. His defence was, that he had been so impeded in performing his part of the agreement that he could not give into the owner's caprice any longer, and he put himself under the protection of a legal adviser, who counselled that he had done enough under his agreement, and could not be called upon to make new plans. The architect brought an action against the employer for a sum which he estimated as the value of his work. The case was heard in the County Court. The plaintiff gave his evidence as above. The defendant, in his charge the architect with incapacity—declared he had been compelled to procure a sketch from another surveyor—made out that no decisive answer had been given by the plaintiff or his solicitor, as to his making fresh plans without payment.

The judge, in summing up, observed that the defendant had not shown such an unreasonable degree of caprice—such an unreasonable requiring of plan after plan, as to justify the architect in throwing overboard the agreement and not proceeding with it, and then turning round and charging him for the mere plan a sum not very much less than he was to receive for carrying out the agreement. The verdict was for the defendant.—I am, Sir, &c.,

JURISTICE.

METROPOLITAN COMMISSION OF SEWERS.

A GENERAL court was held on Thursday morning last, in Committee Room, No. 31, new Houses of Parliament; the Right Hon. Lord Morpeth, M.P., in the chair.—The clerk (Mr. Hertlet) said he had received a letter from Sir John Hall, superintendent of the St. Katharine's Dock Company, stating that the Company were willing to accede to the terms offered by the Commissioners of Sewers as a former court, as to the drainage and management of their property.

The next business was to consider the case of John Hooper, who was fined 5*l*. for breaking into a sewer in the Poplar district, without having previously obtained the consent of the commissioners. The fine was ordered to stand over till this court, to give Mr. Hooper an opportunity of offering any explanation he might think necessary. Upon the case being called on—Mr. Hooper said that he was not aware of the jurisdiction of the commissioners, or that he was in any way doing wrong. He would not for a moment dispute their jurisdiction.—Several commissioners having expressed their opinion upon the question—Lord Morpeth said, after the statement they had heard from Mr. Hooper, under all the circumstances of the case, they had no wish to inflict a large fine, and he should propose that the former sum of penalty be reduced to the nominal fine of one shilling.—Agreed to.

Mr. Hertlet reported that he had received papers from Mr. Ellerman, Mr. Hodgson, the chemist, and other parties, on the subject of a report presented at the last court on the results arrived at in Mr. Hodgson's experiments with the various kinds of deodorizing fluids. It will be remembered that Mr. Hodgson gave a decided answer in favour of that description of fluid submitted by Sir William Burnett.—Lord Morpeth said, by a statement transmitted to him it appeared that Mr. Ellerman was aggrieved at the report that had been printed on this subject, without his (Mr. Ellerman's) statement accompanying it. He thought the whole papers should be referred to Mr. Hodgson to report thereon.—Mr. Leslie thought, in that case, the court would recognise Mr. Hodgson, who, it seemed, was only employed by Mr. Roe, the surveyor, for his own satisfaction.—The Rev. W. Stone said it would be as well that Mr. Ellerman should know that the report in question had not been issued by the court, but had found its way before the public through the newspapers.

Lord Morpeth said that whatever currency the report had obtained was by its being laid before the court, but at the same time an decision had been come to by the court upon it.—The whole subject was then referred to Mr. Roe, and the particular part of the complaint of Mr. Ellerman to Mr. Hodgson.

Henry Church was summoned to show cause why he should not be fined for irregular drainage in Catherine-street, Lambeth. In this case it appeared that the parties had obtained permission of the surveyors of highways, thinking that that body were jointly with the management of highways also Commissioners of Sewers, and stated that that had been the practice in that district. It also appeared that the sewers at each end of Catherine-street had been built by the surveyors of highways, and not by the Commissioners of Sewers.—The surveyor stated that in other parts of the district parties were still proceeding in a similar manner, who would be reported to the court.

The clerk said that he had given notice in *The Builder* and the newspapers, warning parties not to proceed with the construction of sewers and drains, especially in this district and that of the Tower Hamlets, without first obtaining the permission of the Commissioners of Sewers.

Lord Morpeth said it was quite clear that no sewers could be built without permission being first obtained from the surveyors, and the court were determined to levy fines on all persons who might transgress their regulations in future.—It was finally arranged that John Hunt, the surveyor of highways, should be summoned to appear at the next court; and that Church should be re-summoned to attend.—The court will meet again on Thursday, the 25th.

ECCLIOLOGICAL SOCIETY, LATE CAMBRIDGE CAMDEN.—On Tuesday in last week the ninth anniversary meeting of this society was held in the school-room of Christ Church, Albany-street, London. Archdeacon Thorp in the chair. The report, which was read by the hon. secretary, showed that rooms had been engaged for the society's meetings in Bond-street. A donation of 10*l*. was granted to the Frederickian Cathedral. The Rev. J. M. Neale read a paper on "The Narthex, considered with a view to its restoration in Colonial Churches."